arXiv:1602.03438v1 [math.MG] 10 Feb 2016

REPLACING COVARIANCE BY INEQUALITIES IN CLASSIFYING MINKOWSKI VALUATIONS

JUDIT ABARDIA, ANDREA COLESANTI, AND EUGENIA SAORÍN GÓMEZ

Abstract. An analysis of the space of continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuations $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \to \mathcal{K}^n$ for which there is an upper and a lower bound for the volume of $\varphi(K)$ in terms of the volume of the convex body K itself is carried out. Although no invariance with respect to a group acting on the space of convex bodies is imposed, it is proved that only two types of operators appear: a family of operators having as image cylinders over $(n-1)$-dimensional convex bodies and a family essentially given by 1-homogeneous operators.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathcal{K}^n$ denote the set of convex bodies (compact and convex sets) in $\mathbb{R}^n$, endowed with the Hausdorff metric, and let $\mathcal{K}^n_s$ denote the set of convex bodies in $\mathbb{R}^n$ which are symmetric with respect to the origin. The *support function* of a convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is given by

$$h(K, v) = h_K(v) = \max\{\langle v, x\rangle : x \in K\}$$

and it determines uniquely K ([28, Theorem 1.7.1]). Here $v \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\langle v, x\rangle$ is the standard inner product of v and x in $\mathbb{R}^n$. If $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a measurable set, $\mathrm{Vol}(A)$ denotes its volume, that is, its n-dimensional Lebesgue measure. The *dimension of* A is defined as the dimension of the minimal affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ containing A. We denote $\dim A := \dim(\text{affine span}(A))$. We will denote by B_n the unit Euclidean ball in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

An operator $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$ is said to be *G-covariant* for a group of transformations G acting on $\mathcal{K}^n$ if, for any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, there holds

$$\varphi(gK) = g\varphi K \text{ for all } g \in G.$$

The operator φ is *homogeneous of degree* $k \in \mathbb{R}$ if for any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and all $\lambda > 0$,

$$\varphi(\lambda K) = \lambda^k \varphi K.$$

Further, φ is *translation invariant* if for any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$,

$$\varphi(K + t) = \varphi(K) \text{ for all } t \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Let $(\mathcal{A}, +)$ be an Abelian semigroup. An operator $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a *valuation* if for any $K, L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $K \cup L \in \mathcal{K}^n$,

$$\varphi(K \cup L) + \varphi(K \cap L) = \varphi(K) + \varphi(L).$$

An active area of valuation theory deals with the characterization of classical (and new) objects appearing in convex geometry. The first fundamental classification result in this context goes back to Hadwiger [15], who classified the continuous, translation invariant, real-valued valuations, i.e., $(\mathcal{A}, +) = (\mathbb{R}, +)$ in the above definition of valuation, which are also invariant under the rotations of the Euclidean space. Since then, many other classification results have been obtained.

Date: February 11, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 52B45, 52A20. Secondary 52A40, 52A39.

Key words and phrases. Minkowski valuation, Rogers-Shephard inequality, Brunn-Minkowski inequality.

First author is supported by DFG grant AB 584/1-1. Third author is supported by Fundación Séneca project 19901/GERM/15, Spain.

For recent classification results in real-valued valuations, we refer to [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 21] and references therein. Other relevant particular cases of valuations are, for instance, tensor-valued valuations, valuations taking values in matrices or in spaces of functions, for which we refer to the book [28], specially to the accurate list of references inside and also, for a related more recent work, to [8].

Together with the case of real-valued valuations, there has been an increasing interest in the so-called Minkowski valuations. A valuation where $(\mathcal{A},+)=(\mathcal{K}^n,+)$ is called a *Minkowski valuation*, i.e., it is a valuation which takes values in the space of convex bodies endowed with the *Minkowski sum*, defined as

$$K+L=\{x+y\,:\,x\in K, y\in L\},\quad K,L\in\mathcal{K}^n.$$

A systematic study of characterization results in the theory of Minkowski valuations was started by M. Ludwig (see [19, 20]). She obtained, for instance, the following characterization result for the *difference body operator* $D:\mathcal{K}^n\longrightarrow\mathcal{K}^n$ defined by

$$DK:=K+(-K),$$

where $-K:=\{x\in\mathbb{R}^n\,:\,-x\in K\}$.

Theorem A ([20])**.** Let $n\geq 2$. An operator $\varphi:\mathcal{K}^n\longrightarrow\mathcal{K}^n$ is a continuous, translation invariant, $\mathrm{SL}(n)$-covariant Minkowski valuation if and only if there is a $\lambda\geq 0$ such that $\varphi(K)=\lambda DK$.

If instead of $\mathrm{SL}(n)$-covariance in Theorem A, $\mathrm{SL}(n)$-contravariance is imposed, then a characterization for the projection body operator is obtained (see [19]).

After these two seminal results of M. Ludwig, a lot of research on Minkowski valuations has been launched and characterization results for other groups acting on $\mathcal{K}^n$ and for certain subfamilies of $\mathcal{K}^n$ have been obtained. Let us fix the following standard notation: MVal denotes the space of continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuations in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathrm{MVal}_k\subset\mathrm{MVal}$ the ones having degree of homogeneity k. We denote by MVal^G the subspace of G-covariant Minkowski valuations.

In Theorem A the case $G=\mathrm{SL}(n)$ was completely studied. The case $G=\mathrm{SO}(n)$, the group of rotations, has been studied since the beginning of the 70's.

The first results towards the characterization of $\mathrm{MVal}^{\mathrm{SO}(n)}$ were obtained by R. Schneider in [26] and [27], where the space $\mathrm{MVal}_1^{\mathrm{SO}(2)}$ was completely described. In [26] he studied $\mathrm{MVal}_1^{\mathrm{SO}(n)}$, $n\geq 2$, and obtained several characterization results when some other hypothesis is added. In [16], M. Kiderlen, further studied the case $\mathrm{MVal}_1^{\mathrm{SO}(n)}$ and obtained a description of these Minkowski valuations. The general case $\mathrm{MVal}^{\mathrm{SO}(n)}$ was investigated by F. Schuster and T. Wannerer in [33], where the authors obtained a characterization of the even, smooth Minkowski valuations in $\mathrm{MVal}^{\mathrm{SO}(n)}$. A complete characterization for $\mathrm{MVal}^{\mathrm{SO}(n)}$ has been recently completed in [34]. We refer the reader to the works [14, 30, 32, 35] and references therein for further results about classification of Minkowski valuations satisfying equivariance conditions under a group $G\subseteq\mathrm{GL}(n)$.

A new classification result for the difference body operator as a $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-covariant operator but without using the Minkowski valuation property has been recently obtained by R. Gardner, D. Hug and W. Weil, in [11].

Theorem B ([11])**.** Let $n\geq 2$. An operator $\varphi:\mathcal{K}^n\longrightarrow\mathcal{K}^n_s$ is continuous, translation invariant and $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-covariant o-symmetrization if and only if there is a $\lambda\geq 0$ such that $\varphi K=\lambda DK$.

An *o-symmetrization* is an operator $\varphi:\mathcal{K}^n\longrightarrow\mathcal{K}^n_s$, taking values in the space of symmetric convex bodies with respect to the origin. For the sake of brevity, we denote these convex bodies by *o-symmetric* convex bodies.

Theorem B was obtained as part of a systematic study of operations between convex sets (see also [12] and [23]).

With the aim of characterizing known operators in convex geometry by their essential properties, it is also natural to consider inequalities satisfied by the corresponding operators. However, it seems that the first work to consider an inequality as a characterization property is [9], where the authors study continuous, translation invariant, real-valued valuations satisfying a Brunn-Minkowski type inequality. In the case of Minkowski valuations, a characterization result for the difference body using its fundamental affine inequality relating the volume of the difference body DK and the volume of K - the so-called *Rogers-Shephard* or *difference body inequality* - has been recently obtained in [2] (see Theorem C). The Rogers-Shephard inequality ([24]) is usually established together with a lower bound, consequence of the Brunn-Minkowski inequality:
For $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, the following inequality holds

$$2^n \operatorname{Vol}(K) \leq \operatorname{Vol}(DK) \leq \binom{2n}{n} \operatorname{Vol}(K).$$

Equality holds on the left-hand side if and only if K is centrally symmetric and on the right hand side precisely if K is a simplex.

We say that an operator $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$ *satisfies a Rogers-Shephard type inequality* (in short RS) if there exists a non-negative constant C such that for all $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$,

$$\operatorname{Vol}(\varphi K) \leq C \operatorname{Vol}(K).$$

Analogously, φ *satisfies a Brunn-Minkowski type inequality* (in short BM) if there exists a non-negative constant c such that for all $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$,

$$c \operatorname{Vol}(K) \leq \operatorname{Vol}(\varphi K).$$

Theorem C ([2])**.** Let $n \geq 2$. An operator $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}^n_s$ is continuous, $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-covariant and satisfies a Rogers-Shephard type inequality if and only if there is a $\lambda \geq 0$ such that $\varphi K = \lambda DK$.

In the work [2], the authors also show that every continuous and $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-covariant operator satisfies a BM inequality, meaning that, with these hypothesis, the BM inequality does not play a role in classifying the difference body. However, it will play an important role in this paper, where we aim to remove the $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-covariance hypothesis in Theorem C. Indeed, examples do show that without $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-covariance (or continuity), all the so far mentioned properties turn out to be far from being sufficient to classify the difference body (see Section 6 for details).

Motivated by these facts and the known classification results in the theory of Minkowski valuations, we study which operators do appear when removing the $\mathrm{GL}(n)$-covariance property (and any other equivariance) in Theorem C (or [2, Theorem 1.1]) and adding the Minkowski valuation property together with a lower bound for the volume of the image. More precisely, in this paper we investigate continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuations $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$, i.e., $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$, which satisfy RS and BM inequalities. We obtain the following result:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n \geq 2$ and $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$ be a continuous translation invariant Minkowski valuation satisfying a Brunn-Minkowski and a Rogers-Shephard inequality. Then, φ is of one of the following types:*

i) *there exist $\varphi_1 \in \mathrm{MVal}_1$, $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $p_i : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $2 \leq i \leq n-1$, continuous, translation invariant valuations homogeneous of degree i such that*

$$\varphi(K) = p + \varphi_1(K) + p_2(K) + \cdots + p_{n-1}(K) + \operatorname{Vol}(K)q, \quad \forall\, K \in \mathcal{K}^n;$$

ii) *there exist a segment S, an $(n-1)$-dimensional convex body L, with $\dim(L+S) = n$ and $p_i : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, continuous, translation invariant valuations homogeneous of degree i such that*

$$\varphi(K) = L + p_1(K) + \cdots + p_{n-1}(K) + \operatorname{Vol}(K)S, \quad \forall\, K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

An example for the valuations $p_i : \mathcal{K}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is given by $p_i(K) = V_i(K)p$, where $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and V_i are the so-called intrinsic volumes (see [28, Section 4.1]).

By adding the o-symmetrization hypothesis in Theorem 1.1, we get ride of the above translations, depending on the convex body K, and we obtain:

Corollary 1.2. *Let $n \geq 2$ and $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}^n_s$ be a continuous translation invariant Minkowski valuation satisfying a Brunn-Minkowski and a Rogers-Shephard inequality. Then, φ is of one of the following types:*

i) *φ is homogenous of degree one,*

ii) *there exist a centered segment S and an o-symmetric $(n-1)$-dimensional convex body L, with $\dim(L+S) = n$ such that for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$*

$$\varphi(K) = L + \mathrm{Vol}(K)S.$$

In order to completely characterize those operators, it remains to further understand the homogeneous valuations of degree one which satisfy the properties in the results above.

Theorem 1.1 represents a first step towards a better understanding of the continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuations with no equivariance under the action of a group $G \subseteq \mathrm{GL}(n)$. The proof of it relies on classical and more recent results on the theory of real-valued and Minkowski valuations, which will be recalled in Section 2 for the reader's convenience. For exhaustive results on convex geometry we refer to the books [10, 13, 18, 28].

Joining the results from Sections 3, 4 and 5 we prove Theorem 1.1. First, in Section 3 we will prove that the image of a point (a 0-dimensional convex body) needs to be either 0-dimensional or $(n-1)$-dimensional. In Section 4, we consider the case where the image of a point is $(n-1)$-dimensional and in Section 5, the case where the image of a point is 0-dimensional.

2. Background

We denote by Val the Banach space of real-valued, translation invariant, continuous valuations on $\mathcal{K}^n$. The subspace of valuations of degree k is denoted by Val_k.

McMullen proved the following central decomposition result of the space Val.

Theorem 2.1 ([22])**.** *The space of real-valued, translation invariant, continuous valuations on $\mathbb{R}^n$ satisfies*

$$\mathrm{Val} = \bigoplus_{k=0,\dots,n} \mathrm{Val}_k\,.$$

Let $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$ be a continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuation, i.e., $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$. Using the support function of $\varphi(K)$, the decomposition in Theorem 2.1 yields

$$h(\varphi(K), u) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} f_i(K, u), \quad u \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{1}$$

where every $f_i(K,u)$ is continuous in both variables and positively homogeneous of bi-degree $(i,1)$, i.e., it satisfies

$$f_i(\lambda K, \mu u) = \lambda^i \mu f_i(K,u), \quad \forall \lambda, \mu > 0.$$

Since we will use the above decomposition very often in the next, we will refer to it as the *McMullen decomposition* of the continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuation $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$ and homogeneous functions of it.

The functions $u \mapsto f_i(K,u)$ are known not to be, in general, support functions ([25]). However, as the following two results prove, some of them are indeed so and in some cases, all of them are support functions.

Lemma 2.2 ([29]). *Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$. If a convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ satisfies*

$$h(\varphi(K), \cdot) = \sum_{i=k}^{l} f_i(K, \cdot),$$

for some $k, l \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $k \leq l$, then $f_k(K, \cdot)$ and $f_l(K, \cdot)$ are support functions.

A *zonotope* is a convex body sum of finitely many segments. A *zonoid* is a convex body that can be approximated, in the Hausdorff metric, by finite sums of line segments (see e.g. [28, p. 191]). In [31], L. Parapatits and F. Schuster proved that restricted to zonoids $Z \in \mathcal{K}^n$, each function $u \mapsto f_i(Z, u)$ in the McMullen decomposition (1) is a support function.

Theorem 2.3 ([31]). *If $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$ and $Z \in \mathcal{K}^n$ is a zonoid then, there exist convex bodies L_0, $\varphi_1(Z), \dots, \varphi_{n-1}(Z), L_n$, such that,*

$$\varphi(\lambda Z) = L_0 + \lambda \varphi_1(Z) + \cdots + \lambda^{n-1} \varphi_{n-1}(Z) + \lambda^n \operatorname{Vol}(Z) L_n, \tag{2}$$

for every $\lambda > 0$.

If φ has some invariance property, then each f_i in (1) inherits this invariance property. In particular, if φ is also an o-symmetrization, then the functions involved in its McMullen decomposition are even. The proof of this fact, which will be used for the proof of Theorem 1.1, follows a standard argument (see [29]). We include it here by completeness and to illustrate the idea of inductively getting properties of the intermediate functions f_i in the McMullen decomposition.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $n \geq 2$ and let $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$ be an o-symmetrization. Then the function $u \mapsto f_i(K, u)$ in (1) is even for every convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and every $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$.*

Proof. Since $\varphi(K)$ is an o-symmetric convex body, for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, we have $h(\varphi K, u) = h(\varphi K, -u)$ for every $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Using the McMullen decomposition and induction on i we obtain that each homogeneous component f_i also satisfies $f_i(K, u) = f_i(K, -u)$. Indeed, let us consider $h(\varphi(\lambda K), u)$ for a convex body K. Letting $\lambda \to 0$ we get $f_0(K, u) = f_0(K, -u)$. Assume that $f_i(K, u) = f_i(K, -u)$ for every $i < i_0$. Then using the McMullen decomposition for φ in (1) and dividing by λ^{i_0}, we obtain

$$f_{i_0}(K, u) + \lambda \sum_{j=i_0+1}^{n} \lambda^{j-1} f_j(K, u) = f_{i_0}(K, -u) + \lambda \sum_{j=i_0+1}^{n} \lambda^{j-1} f_j(K, -u).$$

Letting now λ go to zero (or by comparing the coefficients of the above polynomial expression in λ) we get $f_{i_0}(K, u) = f_{i_0}(K, -u)$. □

The next result provides useful information on the image of a homogeneous valuation in Val which vanishes on convex bodies of certain dimensions.

Theorem 2.5 ([17, 29]). *Let $\mu \in \mathrm{Val}_j$, $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$.*

i) *If $\mu(K) = 0$ for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\dim K = j$, then $\mu(-K) = -\mu(K)$ for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. In particular, μ is odd.*
ii) *If $\mu(K) = 0$ for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\dim K = j + 1$, then $\mu \equiv 0$.*

Finally, we collect some facts about the functions involved in the above McMullen decomposition of $h(\varphi(K), \cdot)$ which will be used throughout the rest of the work. They can be found, for example, in [29] and [31], or are direct consequences of the previously stated results in this section.

Remark 2.6. Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$, $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $1 \leq i \leq n$.

i) Every function $u \mapsto f_i(K, u)$ is a difference of support functions of convex bodies.
ii) For every $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the functions $K \mapsto f_i(K, u)$ are homogeneous of degree i valuations.
iii) If $\dim K \leq i - 1$, then $f_i(K, u) = 0$.

iv) If $\dim K = i$, then by Lemma 2.2 and item iii), $u \mapsto f_i(K,u)$ is a support function.
v) If $f_i(K,u) = 0$ for every $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\dim K = i+1$, then $f_i(\cdot,u) \equiv 0$, by Theorem 2.5.ii).
vi) If $f_i(K,\cdot)$ is linear for every $i > i_0$, then $f_{i_0}(K,\cdot)$ is a support function.

By Lemma 2.2 the functions $f_0(K,\cdot)$ and $f_n(K,\cdot)$ in the McMullen decomposition are always support functions. Moreover, since $f_0(\cdot,u)$ is homogeneous of degree 0 for every $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, it is a multiple of the Euler characteristic and, hence, independent of the convex body K (but depending on u). For $f_n(K,u)$, we have that it is a multiple (depending on u) of the volume of K (see [15]). In the following, we denote by L_0 (resp. L_n) the convex body with support function $f_0(\{0\},\cdot)$ (resp. $f_n(B_n,\cdot)$ with $\mathrm{Vol}(B_n) = 1$) and write the McMullen decomposition of φ as

$$h(\varphi(K),u) = h(L_0,u) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i(K,u) + \mathrm{Vol}(K) h(L_n,u) \tag{3}$$

for some convex bodies L_0, L_n and some continuous functions $f_i(K,\cdot)$.

To finish this section, we recall the following result on mixed volumes, which determines when a mixed volume of convex bodies does not vanish. We will use it thoroughly in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 2.7 (Theorem 5.1.8 in [28])**.** *For $K_1,\dots,K_n \in \mathcal{K}^n$, the following assertions are equivalent:*

i) *$V(K_1,\dots,K_n) > 0$;*
ii) *there are segments $S_i \subset K_i$ $(i = 1,\dots,n)$ with linearly independent directions;*
iii) *$\dim(K_{i_1} + \cdots + K_{i_k}) \geq k$ for each choice of indices $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq n$ and for all $k \in \{1,\dots,n\}$.*

We will also make use of the following technical result.

Theorem 2.8 (Theorem 6.3.6 in [28])**.** *Let $1 \leq k \leq n$, $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}_k$ and let $S_1,\dots,S_n$ be segments in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

$$\varphi(S_1 + \cdots + S_n) = \sum_{\sigma \in C(n,k)} \varphi(S_{\sigma_1} + \cdots + S_{\sigma_k}),$$

where $C(n,k)$ denotes the set of all ordered subsets of k elements among $\{1,\dots,n\}$ and σ_j is the j-th element of σ, $1 \leq j \leq k$.

3. Existence depending on the image of a point

The aim of this section is to prove that, for a Minkowski valuation $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$, to satisfy RS and BM inequalities implies that the image of a point is either a point or an $(n-1)$-dimensional convex body. That is, we prove the following:

Theorem 3.1. *If $n \geq 2$ and $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$ satisfies RS and BM, then either $\dim L_0 = 0$ or $\dim L_0 = n-1$.*

For the proof of Theorem 3.1, we need to introduce some notations and use more precisely the information given by (3).

Whenever we deal with a mixed volume involving a convex body K, we use both notations, K and h_K, for the arguments. Further, the brackets $[i]$ next to a function (resp. a convex body) in a mixed volume mean that the function (resp. convex body) appears i times in the mixed volume.

We recall first that the hypotheses for φ of continuity, translation invariance and Minkowski valuation yield that we have a McMullen decomposition for φ as in (3).

Let $\lambda \geq 0$ and consider $\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(\lambda K))$. By (3) together with Remark 2.6.i) and the extension of mixed volumes to differences of support functions (see [28, p. 291]), we have

$$\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(\lambda K)) = V(h_{\varphi(\lambda K)}[n]) = V\Big(\big(h_{L_0} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda^i f_i(K,\cdot) + \lambda^n \mathrm{Vol}(K) h_{L_n}\big)[n]\Big).$$

The multilinearity of mixed volumes provides us with a polynomial expansion of $\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(\lambda K))$ in λ which can contain terms of degree 0 until n^n. Moreover, each of the coefficients of the polynomial is a sum of mixed volumes of the functions h_{L_0}, h_{L_n} and $f_i(K,\cdot)$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, involved in the McMullen decomposition of φ. For the sake of brevity, we will write

$$\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(\lambda K)) = \sum_{l=0}^{n^n} v_l^{\varphi}(K)\lambda^l, \tag{4}$$

denoting by v_l^{φ} the coefficient of degree l in the above polynomial expansion of $\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(\lambda K))$. We notice that v_l^{φ} may be negative.

If φ satisfies BM and RS, using the expansion of $\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(\lambda K))$ as a polynomial in λ we obtain useful conditions on the functions f_i of the McMullen decomposition of φ. Indeed, if there exist constants c, C, independent of K and λ, for which

$$c\,\mathrm{Vol}(\lambda K) \leq \mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(\lambda K)) \leq C\,\mathrm{Vol}(\lambda K),$$

then the polynomial in λ for $\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(\lambda K))$ is necessarily a monomial of degree n. Hence, we have the following

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$ satisfy RS and BM.*

i) *If $\dim K < n$, then $v_l^{\varphi}(K) = 0$ for all $0 \leq l \leq n^n$.*
ii) *If $\dim K = n$, then $v_n^{\varphi}(K) \neq 0$.*
iii) *If $\dim K = n$, then $v_l^{\varphi}(K) = 0$ for every $l \neq n$.*

Finally, let us observe, that if for a fixed $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ each function $u \mapsto f_i(K,u)$, $0 \leq i \leq n$, is a convex function, then, since the coefficients v_l^{φ} are sums of mixed volumes of convex bodies, they are all non-negative. In this case, the coefficient v_l^{φ} vanishes if and only if each of the mixed volumes involved in its expression does. This simple remark will be strongly used in the next proof of Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We first show that $\dim L_0 = n$ is not possible. If $\dim L_0 = n$, then $\dim(\varphi(\{p\})) = n$ and $\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(\{p\})) > c\,\mathrm{Vol}(\{p\}) = 0$ for every $c \geq 0$, which contradicts the hypothesis of RS.

From now on, we assume $0 \leq \dim L_0 \leq n-1$.

Let Z be a fixed n-dimensional zonotope. By Theorem 2.3, $u \mapsto f_k(Z,u)$ is a support function for every $1 \leq k \leq n-1$. We denote by $\varphi_k Z$ the convex body with support function $f_k(Z,\cdot)$. Using Corollary 3.2.ii) we have $v_n^{\varphi}(Z) \neq 0$. We recall that $v_n^{\varphi}(Z)$ is the coefficient of the degree n of the polynomial $\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(\lambda K))$ in λ given in (4). Therefore, $v_n^{\varphi}(Z)$ is a sum of mixed volumes of the form

$$V(L_0[a_0], \varphi_1 Z[a_1], \ldots, \varphi_{n-1} Z[a_{n-1}], L_n[a_n]),$$

where $a_0, \ldots, a_n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy:

- since V is a mixed volume in $\mathbb{R}^n$

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k = n, \tag{5}$$

- since relation (2) holds and $V(L_0[a_0], \varphi_1 Z[a_1], \ldots, \varphi_{n-1} Z[a_{n-1}], L_n[a_n])$ is a summand of $v_n^{\varphi}(Z)$,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} k a_k = n. \tag{6}$$

We claim first:

CLAIM 1. *Let $Z \in \mathcal{K}^n$ be a zonotope. Then, $v_n^{\varphi}(Z)$ has only one non-zero summand*

$$V(L_0[a_0], \varphi_1 Z[a_1], \dots, \varphi_{n-1} Z[a_{n-1}], L_n[a_n]) > 0, \tag{7}$$

with $a_0, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying (5) *and* (6).
Moreover,

$$\dim L_0 =: \dim \varphi_0 Z = a_0, \quad \dim L_n =: \dim \varphi_n Z = a_n \quad \text{and} \quad \dim \varphi_k Z = a_k, \quad 1 \le k \le n-1.$$

We notice that, a priori, a_k, $1 \le k \le n-1$, can depend on the zonotope Z.

At the end of the proof, we will show that this summand is one of the following two:

i) $V(L_0[n-1], L_n)$,

ii) $V(\varphi_1 Z[n])$,

and that this implies Theorem 3.1.

Next, we give the proof of Claim 1.

We show first that $\dim \varphi_k Z = a_k$ for every $0 \le k \le n$, which clearly implies the whole claim. Let $a_0, \dots, a_n$ be such that (7) holds. Considering (7), it is clear that $\dim \varphi_k Z \ge a_k$ and there exist (by Theorem 2.7) a_k linearly independent segments $S_1, \dots, S_{a_k} \subset \varphi_k Z$ for every $0 \le k \le n$.

If for some k fixed, $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $\dim \varphi_k Z > a_k$, then there is a segment S linearly independent with $S_1, \dots, S_{a_k}$ and a $j \ne k$ for which $\dim(S + \varphi_j Z) = \dim \varphi_j Z$ because of (7) and Theorem 2.7.

Using again Theorem 2.7, this implies that

$$V(L_0[a_0], \varphi_1 Z[a_1], \dots, \varphi_k Z[a_k + 1], \dots, \varphi_j Z[a_j - 1], \dots, \varphi_{n-1} Z[a_{n-1}], L_n[a_n]) > 0.$$

But this mixed volume is part of the coefficient $v_{n+k-j}^{\varphi}(Z)$ which has to be zero by Corollary 3.2.iii). Hence, we obtain that for any $\{a_0, \dots, a_n\}$ satisfying (7), we have $\dim \varphi_k Z = a_k$, $0 \le k \le n$, and Claim 1 follows.

Next we shall apply Claim 1 to cubes. We introduce first some notation.

Let $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be a basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and define $S_i := [-e_i, e_i]$ and $C_n := S_1 + \dots + S_n$. Clearly C_n is an n-dimensional zonotope and therefore we have $\dim \varphi(C_n) = n$.

Let $C(n,k)$ denote the set of all ordered subsets of k elements among $\{1, \dots, n\}$. For $\sigma \in C(n,k)$, we denote by σ_j the j-th element of σ, $1 \le j \le k$. By polarization of a continuous, translation invariant valuation (see Theorem 2.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_k(C_n) &= \sum_{\sigma \in C(n,k)} \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \dots + S_{\sigma_k}) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma \in C'(n,k)} \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \dots + S_{\sigma_k}) + \sum_{\sigma \in C(n,k) \setminus C'(n,k)} \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \dots + S_{\sigma_k}), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $C'(n,k)$ contains only the elements of $C(n,k)$ for which $\dim \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \dots + S_{\sigma_k}) \ne 0$.

We notice that for every $1 \le k \le n$, we can choose a subset $\Sigma_k \subset C'(n,k)$ for which

$$\dim \varphi_k(C_n) = \dim\Big(\sum_{\sigma \in \Sigma_k} \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \dots + S_{\sigma_k}) \Big) = a_k \tag{9}$$

and such that the dimension of this sum is strictly less than a_k if we omit one of the terms in Σ_k. We notice also that the largest number of elements in Σ_k is a_k and that it is attained, for instance, if $\dim(\varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \dots + S_{\sigma_k})) = 1$ for every $\sigma \in \Sigma_k$. Equation (9) will be used to proof Claim 2 below.

Equation (8) together with McMullen decomposition (3) yield

$$\varphi(C_n) = L_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \varphi_k(C_n) = L_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{\sigma \in C'(n,k)} \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \dots + S_{\sigma_k}) + p(C_n), \tag{10}$$

where $p(C_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is given by $\sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{\sigma \in C(n,k)\setminus C'(n,k)} \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \cdots + S_{\sigma_k})$. In the following, we will refer often to the following sum of convex bodies:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{\sigma \in C'(n,k)} \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \cdots + S_{\sigma_k}). \tag{11}$$

We define $I := (\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ with τ_i the number of subsets $\sigma \in C'(n,k)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$ for which i is an element of σ, that is, the number of summands in (11) in which the segment S_i is contained.

In the next step, we show that $I = (1, \ldots, 1)$ which means that each segment $S_1, \ldots, S_n$ appears exactly in one summand in (11).

Claim 2.

a) I=(1,...,1);

b) for every $1 \leq k \leq n$ *and* $\sigma \in C'(n,k)$

$$\dim \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \cdots + S_{\sigma_k}) = 1; \tag{12}$$

c) for every $1 \leq k \leq n$*, there are exactly* a_k *elements* $\sigma \in C'(n,k)$ *for which* (12) *holds.*

First we prove that $\tau_i \geq 1$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Without loss of generality, assume that $\tau_1 = 0$, i.e.,

$$\dim \varphi_k(S_1 + S_{\sigma_2} + \cdots + S_{\sigma_k}) = 0, \quad \forall\ 1 \leq k \leq n,\ \sigma \in C(n,k).$$

Then, by $\dim L_0 < n$ and (10) it clearly holds

$$0 < \mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(S_1 + \cdots + S_n)) = \mathrm{Vol}(\varphi(S_2 + \cdots + S_n))$$

which is a contradiction with RS since $\mathrm{Vol}(S_2 + \cdots + S_n) = 0$. Hence, $\tau_k \geq 1$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, and each segment appears at least in one summand in (10).

Next we prove that (12) holds.

If $k = n$, then (12) is directly satisfied. Indeed, if $a_n \neq 0$ then $a_n = 1$ since $\sum_{k=1}^n k a_k = n$ and $a_n = \dim \varphi_n(C_n) = \dim \varphi_n(S_1 + \cdots + S_n) = 1$.

Let us assume $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and prove (12) by contradiction. Assume that

$$\dim \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \cdots + S_{\sigma_k}) \geq 2, \quad \text{for some} \quad 1 \leq k \leq n-1$$

and, w.l.o.g., assume that $\sigma \in \Sigma_k$ defined in (9). In this situation, there are at most $(a_k - 1)$ elements σ in Σ_k. Consider the at most $k(a_k - 1)$ different segments associated with these subsets $\sigma \in \Sigma_k$. Define the zonotope P sum of the (at most) $k(a_k - 1)$ segments just described together with the at most $\sum_{l=1,\ldots,n, l\neq k} l a_l = n - k a_k$ segments which belong to Σ_l, $1 \leq l \leq n$, $l \neq k$, but do not belong to Σ_k. By construction it clearly holds that $\dim P \leq n - k a_k + (a_k - 1)k = n - k < n$. Moreover, recalling (9), it also holds $\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi P) \neq 0$. This contradicts RS. Thus, we have (12).

Hence, we have proved that each segment $S_1, \ldots, S_n$ appears at least at one summand of (11) and that each summand of (11) has dimension 1. This implies that in the sum in (8) there are at least a_k summands in $C'(n,k)$, for every $1 \leq k \leq n$.

We show next the third assertion of Claim 2, that is, for every $1 \leq k \leq n$ there are exactly a_k subsets $\sigma \in C'(n,k)$ for which $\dim \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \cdots + S_{\sigma_k}) = 1$ holds. We prove it by contradiction. Consider $\sigma^1, \ldots, \sigma^{a_k} \in \Sigma_k$. Let $\sigma \in C'(n,k)$, $\sigma \neq \sigma^j$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, a_k\}$. Without loss of generality, since (12) holds, we can assume that

$$\dim(\varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1} + \cdots + S_{\sigma_k}) + \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1^2} + \cdots + S_{\sigma_k^2}) + \cdots + \varphi_k(S_{\sigma_1^{a_k}} + \cdots + S_{\sigma_k^{a_k}})) = a_k.$$

Consider the zonotope Q sum of the $n - k a_k$ segments which belong to Σ_l, $1 \leq l \leq n$, $l \neq k$. If these $n - k a_k$ segments are not linearly independent (i.e., if $\dim Q < n - k a_k$), then the zonotope $P := \sum_{j=1}^{a_k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} S_{\sigma_i^j} + Q$ has $\dim P < n$ and, by (10), $\mathrm{Vol}(\varphi P) \neq 0$. This contradicts RS. Assume next, that $\dim Q = n - k a_k$. Consider the at most $(k+1)a_k$ different segment $S_{\sigma_1}, \ldots, S_{\sigma_k}, S_{\sigma_1^1}, \ldots, S_{\sigma_k^1}, \ldots, S_{\sigma_1^{a_k}}, \ldots, S_{\sigma_k^{a_k}}$. If some of the segments

given by the indices in Σ_k was already in Q, consider $P' = \sum_{j=1}^{a_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} a_i^j$. If not, and some of the segments $S_{\sigma_1},\dots,S_{\sigma_k}$ was already in Q, consider $P' = S_{\sigma_1}+\cdots+S_{\sigma_k}+\sum_{j=2}^{a_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} S_{\sigma_i^j}$. Otherwise, all segments $S_{\sigma_1},\dots,S_{\sigma_k}$ are in Σ_k, that is, $\dim(S_{\sigma_1}+\cdots+S_{\sigma_k}+\sum_{j=1}^{a_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} S_{\sigma_i^j}) = ka_k$. In this case, either $\dim(S_{\sigma_1}+\cdots+S_{\sigma_k}+\sum_{j=2}^{a_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} S_{\sigma_i^j}) < ka_k$ or $\dim(\sum_{j=1}^{a_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} S_{\sigma_i^j}) < ka_k$. Define $P' = S_{\sigma_1}+\cdots+S_{\sigma_k}+\sum_{j=2}^{a_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} S_{\sigma_i^j}$ if $\dim P' < ka_k$ and define $P' = \sum_{j=1}^{a_k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} S_{\sigma_i^j}$ otherwise. By construction, we obtain that in all the four cases, $\dim P' < ka_k$ and the zonotope $P = P'+Q$ has $\dim P < n$ and, by (10), $\dim(\varphi P) = n$. This contradicts RS and assertion c) in Claim 2 follows.

Now, the assertion $I = (1,\dots,1)$, which remains to have proved Claim 2, follows immediately from (6), the second and third assertions in Claim 2 and the fact that $\tau_i \geq 1$, $1 \leq i \leq n$.

In order to finish the prove of Theorem 3.1, we show that Claims 1 and 2 imply that the non-zero summand of $v_n^{\varphi}(Z)$ is one of the given in i) or ii) above, i.e., either $v_n^{\varphi}(Z) = V(L_0[n-1], L_n)$ or $v_n^{\varphi}(Z) = V(\varphi_1 Z[n])$. This yields the statement of the theorem since $\dim L_0 = a_0$.

First, we observe that if we prove that either $a_1 = n$ and $a_i = 0$, $i \neq 1$, or $a_0 = n-1$, $a_n = 1$ and $a_i = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, we have proved that the only non-vanishing summand of $v_n^{\varphi}(Z)$ is one of the given in i) or ii).

If $a_n = 1$, then $a_i = 0$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ since (6) holds. Furthermore, using (5), $a_0 = n-1$ and we are in case ii).

If $a_n \neq 1$, then (6) yields $a_n = 0$. In this case, either $a_1 = n$ and we are in case i) or $a_1 \neq n$ what the following argument proves not to happen.

Let us assume $a_n = 0$ and $a_1 \neq n$. We prove by contradiction that it is not possible.

Let $k_0 := \min\{k : a_k \neq 0, k \geq 1\}$. Note that since $\dim L_0 = a_0 < n$, there is $k \geq 1$ such that $a_k \neq 0$ and k_0 is well-defined. For $k_0 a_{k_0} \neq n$, define $k_1 := \min\{k : a_k \neq 0, k > k_0\}$ and for $k_0 a_{k_0} = n$, define $k_1 = k_0$.

Since $a_n = 0$ and, by (6), we have $k_0 + k_1 \leq k_0 a_{k_0} + k_1 a_{k_1} \leq n$ we can assume, w.l.o.g.,

$$\dim(\varphi_{k_0}(S_1+\cdots+S_{k_0})) = 1, \quad \dim(\varphi_{k_1}(S_{k_0+1}+\cdots+S_{k_0+k_1})) = 1. \tag{13}$$

Consider the basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$ given by $\{e_1,\dots,e_{k_0}, e_{k_0}+e_{k_0+1}, e_{k_0+2},\dots,e_n\}$ and the associated zonotope $\tilde{C}_n := [-e_1,e_1]+\cdots+[-e_{k_0},e_{k_0}]+[-(e_{k_0}+e_{k_0+1}),e_{k_0}+e_{k_0+1}]+\cdots+[-e_n,e_n]$. Denote $S_{k_0,k_0+1} := [-(e_{k_0}+e_{k_0+1}),e_{k_0}+e_{k_0+1}]$. We notice that this choice of basis cannot be done if $a_n = 1$, which corresponds to case i) above. Since Claim 2 holds for every cube, assertion a) for $\tilde{C}_n$ implies that the segments defining $\tilde{C}_n$ can only appear once in the corresponding (10) for $\tilde{C}_n$ and

$$\dim(\varphi_{k_0}(S_1+\cdots+S_{k_0-1}+S_{k_0,k_0+1})) = 0, \quad \text{if } k_1 \neq 1. \tag{14}$$

If $k_1 = 1$, then, by definition, $k_0 = k_1 = 1$ and (14) does not hold. Indeed, in this situation it follows $\dim \varphi_1(S_{1,2}) = 1$. However, in this case it holds, by (6), $a_1 = n$, which corresponds to case ii) above.

Consider next the basis $\{e_1,\dots,e_{k_0-1}, e_{k_0}+e_{k_0+1}, e_{k_0+1},\dots,e_n\}$ and the associated zonotope $\overline{C}_n$. By (13), we have

$$\dim(\varphi_{k_1}(S_{k_0+1}+\cdots+S_{k_0+k_1})) = 1.$$

By the first assertion of Claim 2 applied to $\overline{C}_n$, it also holds

$$\dim(\varphi_{k_0}(S_1+\cdots+S_{k_0-1}+S_{k_0,k_0+1})) = 1. \tag{15}$$

Hence, (14) together with (15) yields a contradiction to the assumption $a_n = 0$ and $a_1 \neq n$, and the statement of the theorem holds. □

From the proof of the previous theorem and by approximation of i-dimensional zonoids by n-dimensional ones, the following result holds:

Corollary 3.3. *Let $n \geq 2$ and $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$ satisfy RS and BM.*

i) *If $\dim \varphi\{0\} = \dim L_0 = n-1$, then $\dim L_n = 1$ and $\dim(L_0 + L_n) = n$.*
ii) *If $\dim \varphi\{0\} = \dim L_0 = n-1$ and K is a zonoid, then $\dim \varphi_i K = 0$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$.*
iii) *If $\dim \varphi\{0\} = \dim L_0 = 0$ and K is an n-dimensional zonoid, then $\dim \varphi_1 K = n$. Moreover, $\dim \varphi_i K = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$ and for every zonoid $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. In particular, L_n is a point.*

4. Classification when the image of a point is $(n-1)$-dimensional

In this section we prove the following particular case of Theorem 1.1:

Theorem 4.1. *Let $n \geq 2$ and let $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$ satisfy RS and BM. Then, $\dim \varphi\{0\} = n-1$ if and only if there exist $L \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\dim L = n-1$ and a segment S lying in a transversal line to $\operatorname{span} L$ such that*

$$\varphi(K) = L + p_1(K) + \cdots + p_{n-1}(K) + \mathrm{Vol}(K)S, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n,$$

where $p_i : \mathcal{K}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a continuous, translation invariant valuation homogeneous of degree i, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

First, we will give a proof for the corresponding particular case of Corollary 1.2. We denote by $\mathrm{MVal}^s \subset \mathrm{MVal}$ the space of continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuations which are also o-symmetrizations.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $n \geq 2$ and let $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}^s$ satisfy RS and BM. Then, $\dim \varphi\{0\} = n-1$ if and only if there exist $L \in \mathcal{K}^n_s$ with $\dim L = n-1$ and a centered segment S lying in a transversal line to $\operatorname{span} L$ such that*

$$\varphi(K) = L + \mathrm{Vol}(K)S, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n.$$

We recall first, some (standard) facts which will be used several times in the next and prove some auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 4.3.

i) *Let $\varphi_i \in \mathrm{MVal}_i$ be a continuous translation invariant Minkowski valuation of degree i, $2 \leq i \leq n$. Assume that $\dim \varphi_i(T) = 0$ for every simplex T of dimension i. Then, $\dim \varphi_i(K) = 0$ for every i-dimensional convex body K.*
ii) *Let T be an i-dimensional simplex, $2 \leq i \leq n$. Then, there exists a convex polytope P for which $T \cup P$ is a convex zonotope and such that $T \cap P$ has dimension $i-1$.*

Proof.

i) Each convex body can be approximated in the Hausdorff distance by polytopes and these can be decomposed with simplices (simplicial decomposition) having intersection either empty or a lower-dimensional simplex (see e.g. [28, Proof of Theorem 6.3.1]). The continuity of φ together with the valuation property yield the statement.
ii) Let $g \in \mathrm{GL}(n)$ be such that gT is a translation of the standard i-simplex. Then, we can obtain gT by cutting off the corresponding translation of the unit cube C_i. Let gP be the *rest of the cube*, i.e., $C_i = gT \cup gP$. It is clear that the desired statement holds for gT. Applying now g^{-1}, we obtain it for T.

□

Lemma 4.4. *Let $n \geq 2$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$. We assume that $u \mapsto f_i(Z, u)$ is a linear function for every Z zonotope in $\mathcal{K}^n$. Then,*

i) *$u \mapsto f_i(K, u)$ is a linear function for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\dim K = i$;*

ii) *If $u \mapsto f_i(K, u)$ is a support function for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\dim K = i+1$, then, for $\dim K = i+1$, $u \mapsto f_i(K, u)$ is a linear function.*

Proof. i) First we notice, that from Theorem 2.3 we know that $f_i(Z,\cdot)$ is a support function for every zonotope Z and hence we can write $\varphi_i Z$ for the convex body whose support function is $f_i(Z,\cdot)$. By hypothesis $\dim \varphi_i Z = 0$.

Let T be an i-dimensional simplex. Let P be a polytope so that Lemma 4.3.ii) is satisfied. Then, $\dim \varphi_i(T\cup P) = 0$. Since $\dim(T\cap P) = i-1$, Remark 2.6.iii) yields that $\varphi_i(T\cap P) = \{0\}$ and that for every i-dimensional convex body K and $l \geq i+1$, $f_l(K,u)$ vanishes and $u \mapsto f_i(K,u)$ is a support function. Thus,

$$\varphi_i(T\cup P) = \varphi_i(T\cup P) + \varphi_i(T\cap P) = \varphi_i T + \varphi_i P.$$

Hence, $\dim \varphi_i T = 0$ for every simplex T of dimension i. By Lemma 4.3.i), the statement follows.

ii) We follow the argument in item i) and consider T to be an $(i+1)$-dimensional simplex and P be such that Lemma 4.3.ii) is satisfied. Since $\dim T\cap P = i$, from the previous item we have that $\dim \varphi_i(T\cap P) = 0$. By the hypothesis on φ_i over zonotopes, $\dim \varphi_i(T\cup P) = 0$. From the assumptions, $f_i(K,\cdot)$ is a support function for any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\dim K = i+1$ which yields

$$\varphi_i(T\cup P) + \varphi_i(T\cap P) = \varphi_i T + \varphi_i P.$$

Hence, $\dim \varphi_i T = 0$. By using Lemma 4.3.i), we obtain the result.

□

Lemma 4.5. *Let $n \geq 2$ and let $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$ satisfy RS, BM and $\dim \varphi\{0\} = n-1$. Then $f_i(K,\cdot)$ is a linear function for every $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\dim K = i$.*

Proof. It is enough to consider Lemma 4.4.i) for which Corollary 3.3.ii) ensures the assumptions to be fulfilled. □

Before proving Theorem 4.1, we prove the following lemma, which implies Theorem 4.2.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $n \geq 2$ and let $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}^s$ satisfy RS, BM and $\dim \varphi\{0\} = n-1$. Then $f_i(K,u) = 0$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$.*

Proof. Let us choose a basis $\{e_1,\dots,e_n\}$ of $\mathbb{R}^n$ for which $L_n = [-e_1, e_1]$ (see Corollary 3.3.i). We denote by H the $(n-1)$-dimensional subspace orthogonal to $\mathrm{span}\{e_1\}$. We divide the proof in three steps.

Step 1: First we prove that for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $u = ae_1 + u'$, $v = be_1 + v'$ with $\mathrm{sign}(a) = \mathrm{sign}(b)$, $u', v' \in H$, it holds $f_i(K, u+v) = f_i(K,u) + f_i(K,v)$. Moreover, $f_i(K,w) = 0$ for every $w \in H$.

Let us write $f(K,u)$ instead of $f_{n-1}(K,u)$. We start proving the claim for f and prove, after, the result by reversed induction. In order to do so, we observe first, that for $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ having the same sign:

i) $h(L_n, ae_1 + v) = |\langle e_1, ae_1 + v\rangle| = |a|\|e_1\| = h(L_n, ae_1) + h(L_n, v)$;
ii) $|a+b|\|e_1\| = h(L_n, u+v) = h(L_n,u) + h(L_n,v) = (|a|+|b|)\|e_1\|$.

Since φK is convex, for every convex body K and $\lambda > 0$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq h(\varphi(\lambda K), ae_1 + v) - h(\varphi(\lambda K), ae_1) - h(\varphi(\lambda K), v) \\ &= \lambda^{n-1}(f(K, ae_1 + v) - f(K, ae_1) - f(K,v)) + O(\lambda^{n-2}). \end{aligned}$$

When $\lambda \to \infty$ we obtain

$$f(K, ae_1 + v) \leq f(K, ae_1) + f(K,v) \tag{16}$$

for every convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. In particular also for $-K$. Since $K \mapsto f(K,u)$ is a continuous, translation invariant, $(n-1)$-homogenous valuation vanishing when restricted to $(n-1)$-dimensional convex bodies, Theorem 2.5.i) yields

$$f(K,u) + f(-K,u) = 0, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n \text{ and } u \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

This fact together with (16) with K replaced by $-K$ implies that

$$f(K, ae_1 + v) = f(K, ae_1) + f(K, v) \text{ for every } K \in \mathcal{K}^n, a \in \mathbb{R}, v \in H.$$

If now we consider $u = ae_1 + u'$, $v = be_1 + v'$ with $\operatorname{sign}(a) = \operatorname{sign}(b)$, $u', v' \in H$, we can proceed as before using now ii) to obtain that $f(K, u + v) = f(K, u) + f(K, v)$.

If we apply this with $u = e_1 + w$ and $v = e_1 - w$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(K, u + v) &= 2f(K, e_1) \\ &= f(K, u) + f(K, v) = 2f(K, e_1) + f(K, w) + f(K, -w) = 2(f(K, e_1) + f(K, w)), \end{aligned}$$

which implies $f(K, w) = 0$ for every convex body $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $w \in H$.

In order to proceed with the (reversed) induction, we assume that the claim holds for $i > i_0$ and aim to prove it for $i = i_0$. By the induction hypothesis, and the McMullen decomposition in (3), we can argue for f_{i_0} as we have just done with f to prove the statement.

Step 2: For every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, either the function $u \mapsto f_i(K, u)$ or $u \mapsto f_i(-K, u)$ is a support function and

$$f_i(K, u) = (-1)^{\varepsilon_i(K)} \alpha_i(K) h([-e_1, e_1], u) = (-1)^{\varepsilon_i(K)} \alpha_i(K) |\langle e_1, u \rangle|$$

where $\varepsilon_i(K) \in \{0, 1\}$, $\alpha_i(K) \geq 0$.

Let $u = ae_1 + u', w = be_1 + w' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary vectors with $u', w' \in H$. Step 1 together with the evenness of $u \mapsto f_i(K, u)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(K, u + v) &= f_i(K, (a + b)e_1) + f_i(K, u' + w') = |a + b| f_i(K, e_1), \\ f_i(K, u) + f_i(K, v) &= (|a| + |b|) f_i(K, e_1). \end{aligned}$$

We would like to show $f_i(K, u + v) \leq f_i(K, u) + f_i(K, v)$. If $f_i(K, e_1) \geq 0$ for a convex body K, then this condition holds (since $|a + b| \leq |a| + |b|$).

Hence, if $f_i(K, e_1) \geq 0$, then we are done. If not, we can choose $-K$ and we get $f_i(-K, e_1) \geq 0$ since, by Lemma 4.5 and Theorem 2.5.i), $f_i(K, e_1) + f_i(-K, e_1) = 0$ for every convex body K.

We have that for every i, either the function $f_i(K, \cdot)$ or $f_i(-K, \cdot)$ is a support function. Assume that it is a support function for K, then, $f_i(K, \cdot) = h(\varphi_i K, \cdot)$ for some convex body $\varphi_i K$. From Step 1 we deduce that $\varphi_i K$ lies on the line orthogonal to H. Since $\varphi_i K$ is a centered convex body, it is a centered segment on the line spanned by e_1 and there exists a constant α, depending on K and i such that $\varphi_i K = \alpha_i(K)[-e_1, e_1]$.

Using that $f_i(K, u) = -f_i(-K, u)$, we have the statement.

Step 3: For every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, $\varphi_i K = \{0\}$.

We prove it by induction.

Let $i = 1$. Fix $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\dim K \geq i + 1$. The mixed volume $V(L_0[n-1], f_1(K, \cdot))$ vanishes since it is the coefficient of the 1-homogeneous term of the polynomial in (4). This can be computed as

$$V(L_0[n-1], f_1(K, \cdot)) = (-1)^{\varepsilon(K)} \alpha_1(K) V(L_0[n-1], [-e_1, e_1])$$

which vanishes if and only if $\alpha_1(K) = 0$ since $[-e_1, e_1] = L_n$ and $V(L_0[n-1], L_n) \neq 0$ by our hypothesis.

Assume that $\varphi_i K$ vanishes for every $i < i_0$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. For $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ with $\dim K \geq i_0 + 1$ consider $v_{i_0}^{\varphi}(K)$ the coefficient of degree i_0 of the polynomial in (4). The entries of each of the mixed volumes appearing in the expression of this coefficient have degree at most i_0. Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, the coefficient of degree i_0 is given by $V(L_0[n-1], f_{i_0}(K, \cdot))$, which as for $i = 1$, has to vanish and it does if and only if $\alpha_{i_0}(K) = 0$.

Hence, Claim 3 holds, and the statement of the lemma is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$ satisfy RS and BM. Define the operator $\psi : \mathcal{K}^n \to \mathcal{K}^n_s$ by

$$\psi(K) := D(\varphi K).$$

It is clear that ψ is a continuous, translation invariant, Minkowski valuation which satisfies RS and BM (since both D and φ satisfy them). Moreover, the image of K under ψ is an o-symmetric convex body, since the difference body operator has this property. Hence, we can apply Theorem 4.2 to ψ and obtain that there exist an $(n-1)$-dimensional o-symmetric convex body L and a centered segment S such that

$$\psi(K) = L + \mathrm{Vol}(K)S, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{K}^n,$$

which in terms of the support function, and for a $\lambda > 0$, is written as

$$h(\psi(\lambda K), u) = h(L, u) + \lambda^n \,\mathrm{Vol}(K) h(S, u) \tag{17}$$

On the other hand, the support function of $\psi(K)$ can be also written in terms of the support function of $\varphi(K)$. By the homogeneity of each summand in the McMullen decomposition of φ (see (3)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} h(\psi(\lambda K), u) &= h(\varphi(K), u) + h(\varphi(K), -u) \\ &= h(L_0, u) + h(L_0, -u) + \lambda(f_1(K, u) + f_1(K, -u)) \\ &\quad + \cdots + \lambda^{n-1}(f_{n-1}(K, u) + f_{n-1}(K, -u)) + \lambda^n \,\mathrm{Vol}(K)(h(L_n, u) + h(L_n, -u)), \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

for every $u \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence, comparing the coefficients of the polynomial in λ in (17) and (18), L_n is a segment in the same direction as S and

$$f_i(K, u) + f_i(K, -u) = 0, \quad \forall\, 1 \le i \le n-1,\ u \in \mathbb{R}^n,\ K \in \mathcal{K}^n. \tag{19}$$

Our aim is to show

$$f_i(K, u+v) = f_i(K, u) + f_i(K, v), \quad \forall\, 1 \le i \le n-1, u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n, K \in \mathcal{K}^n. \tag{20}$$

For that, we need the following two claims.

Claim 1: *Let T be an $(i+1)$-dimensional simplex and P a polytope for which Lemma 4.3.iii) holds. Then, $u \mapsto f_i(T, u) + f_i(P, u)$ is a linear function in $\mathbb{R}^n$ for every $1 \le i \le n-1$.*

Since $T \cup P$ is a zonotope, we have, by Corollary 3.3.ii) that $\dim \varphi_i(T \cup P) = 0$, that is, $u \mapsto f_i(T \cup P, u) = h(\varphi_i(T \cup P), u)$ is a linear function. By Lemma 4.5, we also have $\dim \varphi_i(T \cap P) = 0$. Hence,

$$f_i(T, u) + f_i(P, u) = h(\varphi_i(T \cup P), u) + h(\varphi_i(T \cap P), u) = \langle q_{T,P}, u \rangle, \quad q_{T,P} \in \mathbb{R}^n,$$

that is, $u \mapsto f_i(T, u) + f_i(P, u)$ is a linear function for every $1 \le i \le n-1$ and pair (T, P) satisfying Lemma 4.3.ii).

Claim 2: *Assume, without loss of generality, as in the proof of Lemma 4.6, that $S = [-e_1, e_1]$ and denote by H the hyperplane orthogonal to S. Then, for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$, $u', v' \in H$ and $1 \le i \le n-1$,*

$$f_i(K, u' + v') = f_i(K, u') + f_i(K, v'), \tag{21}$$

and

$$f_i(K, ae_1 + u') = f_i(K, ae_1) + f_i(K, u'), \quad \forall\, a \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{22}$$

We proof (21) by backwards induction on i.

Assume first $i = n-1$. Arguing as in Step 1 of Lemma 4.6, we have that, since φK is convex, for every convex body K, for $\lambda > 0$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\ge h(\varphi(\lambda K), u' + v') - h(\varphi(\lambda K), u') - h(\varphi(\lambda K), v') \\ &= \lambda^{n-1}(f_{n-1}(K, u' + v') - f_{n-1}(K, u') - f_{n-1}(K, v')) + O(\lambda^{n-2}). \end{aligned}$$

When $\lambda \to \infty$ we obtain

$$f_{n-1}(K, u' + v') \le f_{n-1}(K, u') + f_{n-1}(K, v'), \quad \forall\, K \in \mathcal{K}^n, u', v' \in H. \tag{23}$$

In order to obtain equality in (23), we use Claim 1 and apply (23) to T and P. From that we obtain

$$f_{n-1}(T, u' + v') = f_{n-1}(T, u') + f_{n-1}(T, v')$$

for every n-dimensional simplex T. By using that $K \mapsto f_{n-1}(K, u')$ is a continuous valuation for every $u' \in H$, we obtain (21) for $i = n-1$.

Assume next, that (21) holds for every $i > i_0$. We show it for $i = i_0$. In this case, we obtain, similarly to the case $i = n-1$, $f_{i_0}(K, u' + v') \leq f_{i_0}(K, u') + f_{i_0}(K, v')$ for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $u', v' \in H$. Hence, applying again Claim 1, we obtain (21) for every $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

The proof of (22) follows in the same way, by using i) in Step 1 in the proof of Lemma 4.6, to obtain $f_{n-1}(K, ae_1 + u') \leq f_{n-1}(K, ae_1) + f_{n-1}(K, u')$.

Now, we proceed to the proof of (20). Let $u = ae_1 + u'$ and $v = be_1 + v'$, $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, $u', v' \in H$. We compute, by using (22),

$$f_i(K, u+v) = f(K, (a+b)e_1 + u' + v') = |a+b| f_i(K, \operatorname{sgn}(a+b)e_1) + f_i(K, u' + v')$$

and

$$f_i(K, u) + f_i(K, v) = |a| f_i(K, \operatorname{sgn}(a)e_1) + |b| f_i(K, \operatorname{sgn}(b)e_1) + f_i(K, u') + f_i(K, v').$$

Assume, without loss of generality, that $a+b > 0$ and $a > 0$. Then, by using (21) and (19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(K, u+v) &= (a - |b|) f_i(K, e_1) + f_i(K, u' + v') \\ &= a f_i(K, e_1) - |b| f_i(K, e_1) + f_i(K, u') + f_i(K, v') \\ &= a f_i(K, e_1) + f_i(K, u') + |b| f_i(K, -e_1) + f_i(K, v') \\ &= f_i(K, u) + f_i(K, v), \end{aligned}$$

for every $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Hence, (20) is proved, and Theorem 4.1 follows. □

5. Classification when the image of a point is 0-dimensional

Next we prove the case of Theorem 1.1 in which $\varphi(\{0\}) = L_0$ is a point.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $n \geq 2$ and let $\varphi \in \mathrm{MVal}$ satisfy RS and BM. Then, $\dim \varphi\{0\} = 0$ if and only if*

$$\varphi(K) = p + \varphi_1(K) + p_2(K) + \cdots + p_{n-1}(K) + \mathrm{Vol}(K) q,$$

with $p, q \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $p_i : \mathcal{K}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$, $2 \leq i \leq n-1$, continuous, translation invariant valuations homogeneous of degree i, and $\varphi_1 \in \mathrm{MVal}_1$ satisfying RS and BM.

Proof. We show that $f_i(K, \cdot)$ is a linear function for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ and $2 \leq i \leq n$ by backwards induction. Then, the result follows from (3).

By Corollary 3.3.iii), we have that if K is a zonoid, then $f_i(K, \cdot)$ is a linear function for every $2 \leq i \leq n$. In particular, L_n is a point. Thus, Lemma 4.4.i) ensures that if K is a convex body with $\dim K = i$, $2 \leq i \leq n-1$, then $f_i(K, \cdot)$ is linear. Further, Remark 2.6.vi) and Lemma 4.4.ii) provide us with $\dim \varphi_{n-1} K = 0$ for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$ of dimension n since $h(L_n, \cdot)$ is a linear function. Thus, since $f_{n-1}(K, \cdot)$ in the McMullen decomposition of φK is also a linear function, we can make a backwards induction argument since, because of Remark 2.6.vi), $f_{n-2}(K, \cdot)$ is now a support function for any $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Using Lemma 4.4 in each step we reach, as desired, that $f_i(K, \cdot)$ is linear for every $K \in \mathcal{K}^n$. Notice that $f_1(K, \cdot)$ is not linear since it is not for zonotopes. □

Finally, we remark that case i) of Corollary 1.2, is directly obtained from Theorem 5.1 together with Lemma 2.4 since the only point which is o-symmetric is the origin.

6. Examples and Final remarks

Finally we provide some examples of operators satisfying all but one of the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1 and hence not fitting in the classification that it provides. We also show in Example 6.7 that there are homogeneous operators of degree one given by Theorem 1.1 whose classification seem to be far from being understood with the methods we use in this work.

Example 6.1. Let L be an $(n-1)$-dimensional convex body and S a segment with $\dim(L+S)=n$. Then

$$K \mapsto DK + \mathrm{st}(K)$$

and

$$K \mapsto L + \mathrm{Vol}(K)S + \mathrm{st}(K)$$

are continuous Minkowski valuations which satisfy RS and BM. Here $\mathrm{st}(K)$ denotes the Steiner point of K (see [28, (1.31)]). However, they are not translation invariant, since the Steiner point $\mathrm{st}(\cdot)$ is not.

Example 6.2. The following operator is continuous, translation invariant and satisfies BM and RS. Further, its image is o-symmetric. However, it is not a Minkowski valuation.

$$K \mapsto \mathrm{conv}\left((K-\mathrm{st}(K)) \cup (-K+\mathrm{st}(K))\right).$$

Example 6.3. Let L be an $(n-1)$-dimensional convex body and S a segment with $\dim(L+S)=n$. Then the operator

$$K \mapsto L + \mathrm{Vol}(DK)S$$

is a continuous, translation invariant operator satisfying BM and RS. However, it is not a valuation.

Example 6.4. For $n \geq 2$, the complex difference body introduced in [1], $D_C : \mathcal{K}^{2n} \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}^{2n}$, with C an o-symmetric planar convex body provides a continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuation which does not satisfies RS. It satisfies, however, BM and its image is symmetric.

Example 6.5. Let L be an $(n-1)$-dimensional convex body and S a segment with $\dim(L+S)=n$. Then the operator

$$K \mapsto L + \mathrm{Vol}(K)S + DK$$

is a continuous, translation invariant, Minkowski valuation satisfying BM. However, it does not satisfy RS.

Example 6.6. Let L be an $(n-1)$-dimensional symmetric convex body and S a segment with $\dim(L+S)<n$. Then the operator

$$K \mapsto L + \mathrm{Vol}(K)S$$

is a continuous, translation invariant, Minkowski valuation satisfying RS. However, it does not satisfy BM.

Unfortunately we are not aware of a translation invariant Minkowski valuation satisfying BM and RS which is not continuous.

The following example shows that the one homogeneous case in the classification provided by Corollary 1.2 does not only consist of the difference body.

Example 6.7. Let $g \in \mathrm{GL}(n)$. Then, the following homogeneous operator of degree one

$$K \mapsto gDK$$

is a continuous translation invariant Minkowski valuation which satisfies RS and BM and whose image is o-symmetric.

Let us finally observe that under the hypothesis of continuity, translation invariance, Minkowski valuation, omitting RS and BM, the addition of a hypothesis on the behavior under a group motion, leads to a tighter classification. Indeed, as Theorem A shows

Let $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow K^n$ be a continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuation. If it is also $\mathrm{SL}(n)$-covariant, Theorem A yields $\varphi K = \lambda DK$ with $\lambda \geq 0$.

Example 6.8. Let $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{K}^n$ be a continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuation. If it is also $\mathrm{SO}(n)$-covariant and satisfies that at least one convex body of dimension greater than one has image a segment, then $\varphi(K) = c_1(K - \mathrm{st}(K)) + c_2(-K + \mathrm{st}(K))$, by Theorem 1.8 in [26].

Example 6.9. In [34], the authors describe completely the continuous, translation invariant Minkowski valuations $\varphi : \mathcal{K}^n \longrightarrow K^n$ which are $\mathrm{SO}(n)$-covariant.

References

[1] Judit Abardia. Difference bodies in complex vector spaces. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 263(11):3588–3603, 2012.

[2] Judit Abardia and Eugenia Saorín Gómez. The role of the Rogers-Shephard inequality in the characterization of the difference body. *Available at* arXiv:1602.00967.

[3] Semyon Alesker. Description of translation invariant valuations on convex sets with solution of P. McMullen's conjecture. *Geom. Funct. Anal.*, 11:244–272, 2001.

[4] Semyon Alesker. Hard Lefschetz theorem for valuations, complex integral geometry, and unitarily invariant valuations. *J. Differential Geom.*, 63(1):63–95, 2003.

[5] Semyon Alesker and Dmitry Faifman. Convex valuations invariant under the Lorentz group. *J. Differential Geom.*, 98(2):183–236, 2014.

[6] Andreas Bernig. Integral geometry under G_2 and $Spin(7)$. *Israel J. Math.*, 184:301–316, 2011.

[7] Andreas Bernig and Joseph H. G. Fu. Hermitian integral geometry. *Ann. of Math.* (2), 173(2):907–945, 2011.

[8] Lorenzo Cavallina and Andrea Colesanti. Monotone valuations on the space of convex functions. *Anal. Geom. Metr. Spaces*, 3:167–211, 2015.

[9] Andrea Colesanti, Daniel Hug, and Eugenia Saorín Gómez. A Characterization of Some Mixed Volumes via the Brunn-Minkowski Inequality. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 24:1064–1091, 2014.

[10] Richard J. Gardner. *Geometric tomography*, volume 58 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, second edition, 2006.

[11] Richard J. Gardner, Daniel Hug, and Wolfgang Weil. Operations between sets in geometry. *J. Europ. Math. Soc.*, 15:2297–2352, 2013.

[12] Richard J. Gardner, Daniel Hug, and Wolfgang Weil. The Orlicz-Brunn-Minkowski theory: a general framework, additions, and inequalities. *J. Differential Geom.*, 97:427–476, 2014.

[13] Peter M. Gruber. *Convex and discrete geometry*, volume 336 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer, Berlin, 2007.

[14] Christoph Haberl. Minkowski valuations intertwining the special linear group. *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, 14:1565–1597, 2012.

[15] Hugo Hadwiger. *Vorlesungen über Inhalt, Oberfläche und Isoperimetrie*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1957.

[16] Markus Kiderlen. Blaschke- and Minkowski-endomorphisms of convex bodies. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 358(12):5539–5564 (electronic), 2006.

[17] Daniel A. Klain. Even valuations on convex bodies. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 352:71–93, 2000.

[18] Daniel A. Klain and Gian-Carlo Rota. *Introduction to geometric probability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.

[19] Monika Ludwig. Projection bodies and valuations. *Adv. Math.*, 172:158–168, 2002.

[20] Monika Ludwig. Minkowski valuations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 357(10):4191–4213 (electronic), 2005.

[21] Monika Ludwig and Matthias Reitzner. A Classification of $\mathrm{SL}(n)$ invariant Valuations. *Ann. of Math.* (2), 172:1219–1267, 2010.

[22] Peter McMullen. Valuations and Euler-type relations on certain classes of convex polytopes. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 35:113–135, 1977.

[23] Vitali Milman and Liran Rotem. Characterizing addition of convex sets by polynomiality of volume and by the homothety operation. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 17 (3), 1450022, 22 pp, 2015.

[24] Claude A. Rogers and Geoffrey C. Shephard. The difference body of a convex body. *Arch. Math.*, 8:220–233, 1957.

[25] Lukas Parapatits and Thomas Wannerer. On the inverse Klain map. *Duke Math. J.*, 162(11):1895–1922, 2013.

[26] Rolf Schneider. Equivariant endomorphisms of the space of convex bodies. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 194:53–78, 1974.

[27] Rolf Schneider. Bewegungsäquivariante, additive und stetige Transformationen konvexer Bereiche. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 25:303–312, 1974.

[28] Rolf Schneider. *Convex bodies: the Brunn-Minkowski theory*, second expanded edition, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 151, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2014.

[29] Rolf Schneider and Franz E. Schuster. Rotation equivariant Minkowski valuations. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, Art. ID 72894, 20 pp., 2006.

[30] Franz E. Schuster. Crofton measures and Minkowski valuations. *Duke Math. J.*, 154:1–30, 2010.
[31] Lukas Parapatits and Franz E. Schuster. The Steiner formula for Minkowski valuations. *Adv. Math.*, 230(3):978–994, 2012.
[32] Franz E. Schuster and Thomas Wannerer. GL(n) contravariant Minkowski valuations. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 364:815–826, 2012.
[33] Franz Schuster and Thomas Wannerer. Even Minkowski valuations. *Amer. J. Math.*, to appear.
[34] Franz Schuster and Thomas Wannerer. Minkowski Valuations and Generalized Valuations. *Available at* arXiv:1507.05412.
[35] Thomas Wannerer. GL(n) equivariant Minkowski valuations. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 60(5):1655–1672, 2011.

Institut für Mathematik, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Robert-Mayer-Str. 10, 60054 Frankfurt, Germany
E-mail address: abardia@math.uni-frankfurt.de

Dipartimento di Matematica "U. Dini", Viale Morgagni 67/1, 50134 Firenze, Italy
E-mail address: colesant@math.unifi.it

Institut für Algebra und Geometrie, Universität Magdeburg, Universitätsplatz 2, 39106 Magdeburg, Germany
E-mail address: eugenia.saorin@ovgu.de